arXiv:1703.00259v1 [q-fin.MF] 1 Mar 2017

Recovering Linear Equations of XVA in Bilateral Contracts

Junbeom Lee* Chao Zhou†

March 2, 2017

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate conditions to represent derivative price under XVA explicitly. As long as we consider different borrowing/lending rates, XVA problem becomes a non-linear equation and this makes finding explicit solution of XVA difficult. It is shown that the associated valuation problem is actually linear under some proper conditions so that we can have the same complexity in pricing as classical pricing theory. Moreover, the conditions mentioned above is mild in the sense that it can be obtained by choosing adequate covenants between the investor and counterparty.

1 Introduction.

The financial crisis in 2007-2008 has forced market participants to rethink about their general practice to price derivatives portfolio. Before the crisis, practitioners and theorists both tended to ignore the credit risk inherent in bilateral contracts, but the credit crunch let people know default risk is not negligible. Banks have become more reluctant to lend money to each other. As a consequence, the spread between rates for borrowing and lending is widened and Libor does not represent a proxy for risk-free rate these days. By this change of game, tradikng desks began to make several adjustments into derivative pricing.

Credit value adjustment (CVA) is correcting derivative price for the credit risk of counterparty. On the other hand, default of hedgers acts as a benefit to them since the hedger can not fully perform

*Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore (a0123861@u.nus.edu).
†Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore (matzc@nus.edu.sg).

the obligation to the counterparty. Debt value adjustment (DVA) is taking into account the benefit at the hedger's default in valuation of derivatives. To secure the obligation, each party posts or receives collateral rather than open its position of derivatives portfolio to the credit risk. If the derivative is backed by collateral, it is considered as risk-free position, so hedgers can finance the position by the same rate when borrowing and lending based on risk-free rate for which OIS rate represents these days. However, a hedger who wants to hedge uncollaterlised or partly collateralised transaction is required to pay extra cost for the possible default of the hedger. Funding value adjustment (FVA) is the expected excess of cost or loss of return. These valuation adjustments together with some others are referred to as XVA.

Among the adjustments, FVA is the most controversial and the debate is still underway. The asymmetry of FVA touches theorists' nerve since it is against some fundamental principles in finance theory. It breaks the assumption in classical pricing theory that everyone can lend and borrow at the same rate. Consequently, once we accept FVA, the fair value of derivatives is not same to the investors and counterparties, so the law of one price does not hold. In Hull & White (2012), it is argued that FVA should not be considered in pricing derivatives and treasury desks should fund the traders by the risk-free rate. The asymmetry of FVA also gives rise to accounting issues because the value recorded in balance sheet is the value that everyone can enter and exit the contract without extra costs. Readers can refer Burgard & Kjaer (2011a) for the suggestion of how to realize derivatives value in the balance sheet to recover symmetric valuations.

Despite all the arguments, we believe a new pricing framework is still needed to take into account FVA in the valuation. The assumption of classical pricing theory that the borrowing/lending rates are same is based on the market condition that the spread was almost negligible. Therefore, the value derived under the assumption is fair only in such economy. Moreover, FVA is not just an accounting quirk but a critical factor to affect company's P&L Castagna (2012b). Also, there is a general belief among traders that the most critical factor widening bid-ask spread at the financial crisis was the funding cost Brigo et al. (2014).

Readers can refer to Bergman (1995); Cvitanić & Karatzas (1993); Korn (1995) for the early treatments considering only different lending and borrowing rate. However, several studies have been done recently to account for CVA, DVA, Collateral and FVA comprehensively in financial literature. Some researchers represent the derivative pricing problem by partial differential equation form Burgard & Kjaer

(2011b); Wu (2015). Another alternative to deal with non-linear problems is backward stochastic differential equation Crépey (2015a,b). Also, Brigo et al. (2014) provide an intuitive way of modifying payoff functions. For more detail and complete discussion, we also recommend Brigo et al. (2013); Crépey et al. (2014). Considering funding cost is important not only in derivative pricing but also optimal investment. Interested readers can refer to Bo & Capponi (2016).

They all obtain a form of representation of XVA in their papers with different frameworks. Nonetheless, because of the non-linearity in FVA, pricing derivatives ends up with leaning on numerical approximation such as typical least square monte-carlo simulation which demands high computation cost. Readers can find some papers for explicit forms of XVA Bichuch et al. (2015a,b); Piterbarg (2010). However, in the papers, the derivation of explicit solution is assumed on the condition that the borrowing and lending rate are same. More recently, in Brigo et al. (2016), under a different setting and some assumptions, they found that the valuation of vulnerable options can be recast as a Black-Scholes model with dividends.

The assumption above may be understood that they assume that only one situation between lending and borrowing happens but this cannot be guaranteed. In this paper, we investigate a way to obtain such guarantee. We will impose some conditions that we can make hedging involved only one case between lending and borrowing. The key ingredient is making use of comparison principle in BSDEs. A similar argument can be found in El Karoui et al. (1997). However, now we have collateral and default risk, so we should apply comparison principle with caution.

In our analysis, we will not change what are given such as funding rates to get the condition. Instead, we will choose covenants such as mark-to-market rule and the interest rate on which collateral is based on. Also, we consider stochastic interest rate so this research can be applied to interest rate derivatives but the spreads among each pair of interest rates are deterministic. However, volatility processes are deterministic and hazard rates are constant. Later, Malliavin calculus will be used to recover linear equations and the condition of deterministic parameters will be needed to apply Malliavin calculus. The constant hazard rates are assumed to use argument of Malliavin calculus with respect to a Lévy measure.

2 Model.

2.1 Reduced form model.

We begin with typical setup for reduced form model. In what follows, indices I and C are used to refer "investor" (sometimes trader or hedger) and "counterparty", respectively. We denote the default time of the investor and counterparty by τ^I and τ^C. Let τ denotes $\tau^I \wedge \tau^C$ and $\bar{\tau}$ denotes $\tau \wedge T$, where T is the maturity of a derivative. We use the symbol H_t^i to denote $\mathbb{1}_{\tau^i \leq t}$ for $i \in \{I, C\}$, the default indicator process. The notation $W_t = (W_t^0, W_t^1, \ldots, W_t^d)^*$ means the standard Brownian motion on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ with risk neutral probability $\mathbb{P}$. Here, * indicates transpose. The dimension of Brownian motion will be determined by the structure of payoffs for derivatives. $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ is the reference filtration generated by the Brownian motion augmented by null sets. Let $\mathbb{H}^i = (\mathcal{H}_t^i)_{t\in[0,T]}$ be $\sigma(H_s^i; 0 \leq s \leq t)$ for $i \in \{I, C\}$. Now, let us equip with a probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{G}, \mathbb{P})$, where $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{F} \vee \mathbb{H}^I \vee \mathbb{H}^C$. We define *survival process* of τ^i with respect to filtration $\mathbb{F}$, $G_t^i := \mathbb{P}(\tau^i > t|\mathcal{F}_t)$. Also we denote $G_t := \mathbb{P}(\tau > t|\mathcal{F}_t)$, $F_t^i := 1 - G_t^i$ and $F_t := 1 - G_t$.

Throughout this paper, we will assume that G_t^i is non-increasing and absolutely continuous. This is a slight relaxation of *immersion hypothesis* under $\mathbb{P}$ that all $\mathcal{F}_t$-martingale processes are $\mathcal{G}_t$-martingale in $\mathbb{P}$. We admit here this assumption is somewhat strong since it is saying, in some sense, that information regarding defaults is simply added independently into the reference filtration. We impose such assumption to get simplicity in calculation, but it comes at the cost that we cannot fully capture the dynamics of derivatives whose payoff is also related to defaults such as credit derivatives. For the discussion of advantage, disadvantage and how remedy to the weakness in *immersion hypothesis*, we recommend Bielecki et al. (2008); Crépey (2015a,b); Crépey & Song (2016) to readers.

Let us postulate $G_0^i = 1$ and $G_t^i > 0$ so that we can define *hazard process* $\Gamma_t^i = -\ln G_t^i$. Also, since we assume that G_t^i is absolutely continuous, there exists *hazard rate* λ_t^i satisfying $\Gamma_t^i = \int_0^t \lambda_s^i ds$ and λ_t will be denoted for $\lambda_t^C + \lambda_t^I$. It is known that the process $M_t^i := H_t^i - \int_0^t (1 - H_{s-}^i)\lambda_s^i ds$ is $\mathcal{G}_t$-martingale. To simplify our argument, the $\lambda^i = \lambda_t^i$ will be assumed to be constant.

2.2 Assets and accounts.

2.2.1 Risky assets.

The basic risky assets involved in hedging are defaultable bonds and underlying securities associated with payoff derivatives. $P_t^I = P^I(t,T)$ and $P_t^C = P^C(t,T)$ means bonds with maturity T, which are subject to default, issued by the investor and counterparty respectively. We assume underlying assets, $P_t = (P_t^0, P_t^1, \ldots, P_t^d)$, are default-free. The dynamics of processes are governed by

$$dP_t^i = P_t^i(r_t dt + \sigma_t^i dW_t), i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, d\} \tag{1}$$

$$dP_t^i = P_t^i(r_t dt + \sigma_t^i dW_t) - P_{t-}^i dM_t^i, i \in \{I, C\}, \tag{2}$$

where r_t is the risk-free rate. r_t can have randomness but the volatility $\sigma_t^i \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is bounded, deterministic and left continuous. Let σ_t be a $d+1$ by $d+1$ matrix whose i-th row vector is σ_t^i in (1), and $\mathbb{1} \coloneqq (1, 1, \cdots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Also, for all $t \in [0,T]$, σ_t has its bounded inverse matrix σ_t^{-1}. Then (1) can be written as

$$dP_t = diag(P_t)(\mathbb{1} r_t dt + \sigma_t dW_t). \tag{3}$$

The volatility σ^I and σ^C in (2) are the same as σ^0 in (1) when non-defaultable assets are also bonds. Unless the product is based on interest rates, we will ignore the σ_t^i in (2). Otherwise it becomes incomplete market model, so we should start from agreeing what the fair value of the product is.

Remark 1. *A more realistic hedging asset is rolling CDS. Still, many traders use CDS to hedge counterparty credit risk. Nevertheless, CDS is not fully liquid in financial market except the CDS emitted on the day. Hence, general practice is to use the CDS issued freshly and unwind the position held by the trader, in which it is called rolling CDS. If we denote the rolling CDS by R_t, the possible dynamics could be*

$$dR_t = r_t R_t dt + \Delta_t dM_t^i + (1 - H_t^i) d\mathcal{M}_t^i, \tag{4}$$

where Δ_t is a protection payment and $\mathcal{M}_t^i$ is a $\mathcal{F}_t$-martingale process under immersion hypothesis. We do not encounter many difficulties to consider rolling CDS as an hedging asset. However, the real difficulty we face is that the tenor of CDS is not fully diversified. Therefore, a discrete rolling CDS should be taken into account as an hedging asset by further research. Interested readers can refer Bielecki et al. (2008).

2.2.2 Locally risk-less assets.

Other asset processes engaged in the trading are money accounts of funding and collateral. In bilateral contracts, the investor and counterparty post or receive collateral, which will be denoted by C_t , to mitigate the credit risk of each other. If one posts collateral, the party will receives money from the other party according to a given interest rate. The interest rate involved in the case when the investor posts the collateral will be denoted by $r_t^{c,l}$. Meanwhile, when the investor receive the collateral, the counterparty will receive money based on $r_t^{c,b}$. The accounts for the margining procedure, denoted by $B^{c,l}$ and $B_t^{c,b}$, are absolutely continuous processes with

$$dB_t^{c,l} = r_t^{c,l} B_t^{c,l} dt, \quad dB_t^{c,b} = r_t^{c,b} B_t^{c,b} dt. \tag{5}$$

In the process, hedging and posting (or receiving) collateral, the investor will borrow necessary money, with the rate r_t^b, and make a loan with redundant money based on r_t^l. The processes of borrowing accounts B_t^b and lending accounts B_t^l are by

$$dB_t^l = r_t^l B_t^l dt, \quad dB_t^b = r_t^b B_t^b dt. \tag{6}$$

To include interest rate derivatives, we allow short rates to have randomness, the randomness is shared by all rates. In other words, the spreads between the above rates and r_t are all deterministic, in which it is not very restrictive.

3 Backward stochastic differential equations approach.

3.1 Self financing strategy.

A *trading strategy* is a $\mathbb{G}$ predictable process in $\mathbb{R}^{d+7}$ that indicates the amount of each asset's position. We formally denote it by

$$\varphi = (\xi, \eta) = (\xi_t^0, \xi_t^1, \ldots, \xi_t^d, \xi_t^I, \xi_t^C, \eta_t^l, \eta_t^b, \eta_t^{c,l}, \eta^{c,b}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+7}. \tag{7}$$

ξ_t^i means the number of shares in risky assets, P_t^i, for $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, d, I, C\}$. $\eta_t^l, \eta_t^b, \eta_t^{c,l}$ and $\eta_t^{c,b}$ are the share of each account, $B_t^l, B_t^b, B_t^{c,l}$ and $B_t^{c,b}$ respectively. Let us make some assumptions here for relations about *trading strategies* and associated terms. If we need to change our funding state from borrowing to lending (or from lending to borrowing), we unwind the previous accounts first instead of holding both borrowing and lending accounts. So, we assume $\eta_t^l \eta_t^b = 0$ and $\eta_t^{c,l} \eta_t^{c,b} = 0$ for all $t \in (0, T]$. In addition, $\eta_t^l \geq 0, \eta_t^b < 0, \eta_t^{c,l} \geq 0$ and $\eta_t^{c,b} < 0$. By convention, $C_t \geq 0$ means the derivative seller posts the collateral and $C_t < 0$ means receiving. Therefore, $C_t^+ = \eta_t^{c,l} B_t^{c,l}$ and $C_t^- = -\eta_t^{c,b} B_t^{c,b}$. Hedging strategies and collateral amount are affected by the cash flow structure of the derivative. Also, to avoid theoretical complication, we define an *admissible* hedging strategy and the following arguments will be made on the *admissible* hedging strategy.

Definition 1. *A trading strategy φ is admissible if ξ_t^i is LCRL[1] and locally bounded for all $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, d, I, C\}$.*

The cumulative cash flow will be described by a finite variation process A_t. Also, the close-out amount upon default is determined in advance before each party enter the contract. We define θ_τ to be the cash flow at default. In the case of European option whose payoff function is $\Phi(P_T)$, the cumulative cash flow $A_t = \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau \leq T\}} \mathbb{1}_{[\tau, T]}(t) \theta_\tau + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau > T\}} \mathbb{1}_{[T]}(t) \Phi(P_T)$. Now, we are prepared to define *hedger's self financing wealth process*. Note that, in the world of XVA, funding costs are specific for each hedgers, so is the definition of self financing. For simplicity of notation, we will write $\xi_t^{d+1}, \xi_t^{d+2}, P_t^{d+1}$ and P_t^{d+2} for ξ_t^I, ξ_t^C, P_t^I and P_t^C.

Definition 2. *The hedger's wealth process on $(0, \bar{\tau}]$, $V_t(\varphi, A, C)$, defined as*

$$V_t(\varphi, A, C) = \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \xi_t^i P_t^i + \eta_t^l B_t^l + \eta_t^b B_t^b + \eta_t^{c,l} B_t^{c,l} + \eta_t^{c,b} B_t^{c,b}, \tag{8}$$

is self financing if for all $t \in (0, \bar{\tau}]$

$$\begin{aligned} V_t(\varphi, A, C) =& V_0(\varphi, A, C) + \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \int_{0+}^t \xi_s^i dP_s^i + \int_0^t \eta_s^l dB_s^l + \int_0^t \eta_s^b dB_s^b \\ &+ \int_0^t \eta_s^{c,l} dB_s^{c,l} + \int_0^t \eta_s^{c,b} dB_s^{c,b} - A_t. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Note that A_t has all cash flow including the cash flow upon default. Hence, by convention, we set

[1] LCRL stands for left continuous and right limit. It is often called càglàd.

$V_{\bar{\tau}}$ and $C_{\bar{\tau}}$ absorbed in $A_{\bar{\tau}}$. Since $\eta_t^{c,l}B_t^{c,l} + \eta_t^{c,b}B_t^{c,b} = C_t, \eta_t^{c,l}\eta_t^{c,b} = 0, \eta_t^{c,l} \geq 0, \eta^{c,b} < 0, \eta_t^l\eta_t^b = 0, \eta_t^l \geq 0$ and $\eta_t^b < 0$, the equation (9) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} dV_t =& \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \xi_t^i dP_t^i + (V_t - C_t - \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \xi_t^i P_t^i)^+ r_t^l dt - (V_t - C_t - \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \xi_t^i P_t^i)^- r_t^b dt \\ &+ C_t^+ r_t^{c,l} dt - C_t^- r_t^{c,b} dt - dA_t. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

To reduce the equation, we define *hedger's portfolio* to be $V_t - C_t$, and it is denoted by Y_t following the notation in typical backward stochastic differential equations. For simplicity, the notations, $\tilde{X}_t$ will be used for all processes X_t. $\tilde{X}_t$ is a discounted process of X_t with discounting rate, r_t^D. r_t^D will be chosen later for different situations but we simply denote $\tilde{X}_t$ to avoid abusing notations.

Definition 3. *For all processes X_t, $\tilde{X}_t = e^{-\int_0^t r_s^D ds} X_t$, where r_t^D can be r_t^l, r_t^b or r_t. For a constant κ, $\tilde{\kappa} = \kappa e^{-\int_0^T r_s^D ds}$.*

The money account process, $e^{\int_0^t r_s^D ds}$, is denoted by B_t^D. If the involved interest rate is r_t, we denote it by B_t. As mentioned, spreads between interest rates, that is denoted by $b_t^l = r_t^l - r_t^D, b_t^b = r_t^b - r_t^D, b_t^{c,l} = r_t^{c,l} - r_t^D$ and $b_t^{c,b} = r_t^{c,b} - r_t^D$, are all deterministic. With these notations, the equation (10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{Y}_t =& \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \xi_t^i d\tilde{P}_t^i + (\tilde{Y}_{t-} - \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_{t-}^i)^+ b_t^l dt - (\tilde{Y}_{t-} - \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_{t-}^i)^- b_t^b dt \\ &+ \tilde{C}_t^+ b_t^{c,l} dt - \tilde{C}_t^- b_t^{c,b} dt - d\tilde{C}_t - (B_t^D)^{-1} dA_t. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

This is the BSDE that we will mainly deal with. We define the additional margining cost term, $m(t, \tilde{C}_t) := \tilde{C}_t^+ b_t^{c,l} - \tilde{C}_t^- b_t^{c,b}$. By following the typical notation for the generator of BSDEs, we also denote that

$$f(t, \tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{P}_t^I, \tilde{P}_t^C, \tilde{C}_t) = (\tilde{Y}_t - \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_t^i)^+ b_t^l - (\tilde{Y}_t - \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_t^i)^- b_t^b. \tag{12}$$

If there is no possibility of misunderstanding, we will write $\tilde{f}_t$ for $f(t, \tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{P}_t^I, \tilde{P}_t^C, \tilde{C}_t)$. We separate the margining cost term from the generator, if we will deal with the case that C_t is chosen exogeneously. Sometimes, hedger can gain hedging assets from repo market instead buying them directly. In other words, we will consider other accounts, B_t^i, with interest rates r_t^i, and hedging

strategies η_t^i such that $\xi_t^i P_t^i + \eta_t^i B_t^i = 0$ for a subset of index set, $\rho \subset \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$. Then the generator becomes

$$f(t, \tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{P}_t^I, \tilde{P}_t^C, \tilde{C}_t) = (\tilde{Y}_t - \sum_{i \in \rho^c} \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_t^i)^+ b_t^l - (\tilde{Y}_t - \sum_{i \in \rho^c} \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_t^i)^- b_t^b - \sum_{i \in \rho} b_t^i \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_t^i, \tag{13}$$

where $b_t^i = r_t^i - r_t^D$. Denoting by

$$K_t = \left(Y_t - \sum_{i \in \rho^c} \xi_t^i P_t^i \right), \tag{14}$$

we can write that

$$\tilde{f}_t = \left(\mathbb{1}_{K_t \geq 0} b_t^l + \mathbb{1}_{K_t < 0} b_t^b \right) \tilde{K}_t - \sum_{i \in \rho} b_t^i \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_t^i. \tag{15}$$

Proposition 1. *Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be an equivalent martingale measure with B_t^D as the numéraire. If $\tilde{Y}_t$ is a solution of the following BSDE,*

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{Y}_t =& \tilde{C}_t - \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} (B_s^D)^{-1} dA_s + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \tilde{f}_s ds + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} m(s, \tilde{C}_s) ds \\ &+ \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i \sigma_s^i dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}} - \sum_{i \in \{I,C\}} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_{s-}^i dM_s^{i,\mathbb{Q}}, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

then $Y_t + C_t$ is the hedger's self financing wealth process, $V_t(\varphi, A, C)$.

We will take that $r_t^D = r_t$ if we do not explicitly specify it. From (16), when $\tau > T$ (so, $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{G}$), $r_t^l = r_t^b = r_t = r_t^D$ and $C_t = 0$, we recover the result of the classical risk neutral pricing formula,

$$V_t = B_t \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{t+}^{T} B_s^{-1} dA_s \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right). \tag{17}$$

Let us decompose each term in (16) and understand what it means. We will write that $A_t = \mathbb{1}_{(0,\tau)}(t) A_t^c + \mathbb{1}_{\tau \leq T} \mathbb{1}_{[\tau,T]}(t) \theta_\tau$. This representation can be understood that A_t^c is (clean) dividends from the contract and θ_τ is the cash flow upon defaults. A possible definition of θ_τ can be that

$$\theta_\tau = \varepsilon_\tau + \mathbb{1}_{t < \tau^C \leq \tau^I \wedge T} L_C (\varepsilon_\tau - C_{\tau-})^- - \mathbb{1}_{t < \tau^I \leq \tau^C \wedge T} L_I (\varepsilon_\tau - C_{\tau-})^+, \tag{18}$$

where $L_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a loss rate of of each party and ε_τ is the CSA[2] close-out amount. The second term is the source of CVA. When the counterparty defaults and the collateral is not enough to cover the close-out amount, additional cost will be incurred to the investor depending on the loss rate of the counterparty. On the contrary, the investor's default make the investors pay less than what they were supposed to pay. The minus sign beside the third term indicates that the counterparty's loss behaves as a benefit to the investor. With these notations, (16) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} V_t =& CP_t + CVA_t + DVA_t + FVA_t + MCA_t \\ =& B_t\mathbb{E}\left(\int_{(t,\tau)} B_s^{-1} dA_s^c + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\le T\}}\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau|\mathcal{G}_t\right) \\ &+ B_t\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{t<\tau^C\le\tau^I\wedge T}L_C(\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau - \tilde{C}_{\tau-})^-|\mathcal{G}_t) \\ &- B_t\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{t<\tau^I\le\tau^C\wedge T}L_I(\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau - \tilde{C}_{\tau-})^+|\mathcal{G}_t) \\ &+ B_t\mathbb{E}\left(-\int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \tilde{f}_s ds|\mathcal{G}_t\right) + B_t\mathbb{E}\left(-\int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} m(t,\tilde{C}_s)ds|\mathcal{G}_t\right) \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The notation CP_t is from the abbreviation of clean price and MCA_t is from margin cost adjustment. If ε_τ and C_t is given exogeneously, the representations of MCA_t, CVA_t and DVA_t are explicit. However, the difficult term is FVA_t, since $\tilde{f}_t$ is a function of $\tilde{Y}_t$. We will discuss how to avoid the difficulties in the following section.

Remark 2. *Our main task is to find the value of V_t (or Y_t). However, is the value fair in a sense? If it is so, in what sense is it fair? Unfortunately, we cannot guarantee that it is an arbitrage free price. Actually, we have not even define the concept of arbitrage freeness. Unlike the case in classical pricing theory, the fairness of the derivatives price is not global for all market participants. Therefore, we should newly define the arbitrage freeness and it should be carefully investigated if the price is arbitrage free for a specific investor . Another issue here is the collateral rule. According to whether the collateral is posted by cash or risky asset and whether rehypothecation is allowed or not, the self-financing condition is slightly changed. We tacitly ignore such issues to assume the simplest model. Nonetheless, such extensions can be obtained by simple modifications. Readers can refer Bielecki & Rutkowski (2015) for the various collateral rule and Bichuch et al. (2015a); Bielecki & Rutkowski (2015) for definition of arbitrage free condition under*

[2]CSA stands for Credit Support Annex which is a part of ISDA Master Agreement. Collateral rule and close-out amount in bilateral contracts are often determined in CSA.

XVA. In many cases, the arbitrage free condition holds with very mild and realistic condition, such that $r_t^l \le r_t \le r_t^b$ *and* $r_t^{c,l} \le r_t \le r_t^{c,b}$.

3.2 Main result.

Malliavin calculus is an useful tool to analyze BSDEs. Let us start this section with writing the main BSDE (16) with respect to compensated jump measures of each H_t^i. Let $\mu^i(dt,dz)$ be the jump measure of H_t^i. Then the *dual predictable projection* of μ^i is $\nu^i(dt,dz) = \mathbb{1}_{t\le\tau^i}\lambda^i\delta_{\{1\}}(dz)dt$ (Theorem 11.49 in He & Yan (1992)). Let $\tilde{\mu}^i$ be $\mu^i - \nu^i$. Then $M_t^i = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}} \mathbb{1}_{|z|\le 1} z\tilde{\mu}^i(ds,dz)$ (Theorem 11.25 in He & Yan (1992)). However, since the only possible jump size of M_t^i is 1, we simply write $M_t^i = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}} z\tilde{\mu}^i(ds,dz)$. With this form of the jump measure, for $t < \bar{\tau}$ the equation (16) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{Y}_t =& \tilde{C}_t - \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} (B_s^D)^{-1} dA_s + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \tilde{f}_{s-} ds + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} m(s,\tilde{C}_s) ds \\ &+ \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i \sigma_s^i dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}} - \sum_{i\in\{I,C\}} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_{s-}^i z\tilde{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}(ds,dz). \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Let $D_{k,t}$ be the Malliavin derivative with respect to k-th Wiener space and $D_{i,t,z}$ be the Malliavin derivative with respect to the jump with index i, where $i \in \{I,C\}$. We denote by $D_t = (D_{0,t}, D_{1,t}, \dots, D_{d,t})^*$ and $D_{t,z} = (D_{I,t,z}, D_{C,t,z})^*$. Also, the space of Malliavin differentiable function is denoted by $\mathbb{D}_{1,2}$. For the detail of Malliavin calculus, readers can refer to Di Nunno et al. (2009). (There are some minor issues since H_t^i is not a Lévy process. We will deal with it in appendix) With this notation, by a simple observation to (20), we obtain following relation between integrands of stochastic integral and Malliavin derivatives

Lemma 1. *Let us assume the solution of (20) is Malliavin differentiable (see Appendix). For* $t < \bar{\tau}$ *the followings hold,* $d\mathbb{P}\otimes dt$ *a.s.*

1) If $\sigma_t^0 = \sigma_t^I = \sigma_t^C$, $\mathbb{1}\cdot(\sigma_t^*)^{-1} D_t\tilde{Y}_t = \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_t^i$.

2) If $\sigma_t^I = \sigma_t^C = 0$, $\mathbb{1}\cdot(\sigma_t^*)^{-1} D_t\tilde{Y}_t = \sum_{i=0}^{d} \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_t^i$.

3) For $i \in \{I,C\}$, $-D_{i,t,1}\tilde{Y}_t = \xi_t^i \tilde{P}_t^i$.

If we assume the solution is Markov with respect to P^I and P^C, the direct consequence from the

third part of the lemma, for $t < \tau$,

$$\xi_t^I \tilde{P}_t^I = -\tilde{\varepsilon}_t + L_I(\tilde{\varepsilon}_t - \tilde{C}_{t-})^+ + \tilde{V}_t(P_t), \tag{21}$$

$$\xi_t^C \tilde{P}_t^C = -\tilde{\varepsilon}_t - L_C(\tilde{\varepsilon}_t - \tilde{C}_{t-})^- + \tilde{V}_t(P_t). \tag{22}$$

To understand (21) and (22), let us consider the case that $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \tilde{V}_t$. Then the investor hedges DVA by buying back their bonds only when $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ is positive, which can be explained that the investor has an obligation to pay. Also, only if they have credit from the counterparty, the investor hedges CVA by selling the counterparty's bond. However, hedging DVA by going long its own bonds is arguable in practice. Readers can find the discussion in Castagna (2012a)

The first result of Lemma 1 will be used for the case that the first risky hedging asset, P_t^0 is a bond which pays 1 at the maturity, T. Since P^0, P^I and P^C are the bonds with the same maturity T, it is assumed that they have the same volatility. The second result can be understood as a case that we do not need to consider stochastic interest rates. However, as we will see later, to make use of the second result we need to consider a case that defaultable bonds, P_t^I and P_t^C, are traded in swapped form from repo markets.

The Lemma 1 is another characterization of hedge amount of risky assets. This characterization is useful since the Malliavin derivatives of $\tilde{Y}_t$ is a solution of a BSDE with the same structure with the original BSDE. Recall that the generator has K_t^+ and K_t^-. We will remove one of them by comparison of $\tilde{Y}_t$ and $\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_t^*)^{-1} D_t \tilde{Y}_t$. Keeping this in mind, we investigate two popular covenants.

3.2.1 $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t = \mathbb{E}(\int_{t+}^T B_s^{-1} dA^c | \mathcal{F}_t)$ and $\tilde{C}_t = \gamma \tilde{\varepsilon}_t$ where $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$.

Let us write

$$\tilde{J}_t = \tilde{C}_t - \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} (B_s^D)^{-1} dA_s + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} m(s, \tilde{C}_s) ds. \tag{23}$$

Proposition 2. *Let $t < \tau$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ be an equivalent martingale measure with B_t^D as the numéraire. Assume*

(i) $\tilde{J}_t \in \mathbb{D}_{1,2}$ for all $t \in [0, \bar{\tau}]$,

(ii) for all $t \in [0, \bar{\tau}]$, $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$, $i, j \in \{I, C\}$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\int_0^{\bar{\tau}} |D_{k,s}\tilde{J}_t|^2 ds\right) < \infty, \tag{24}$$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\int_0^{\bar{\tau}} |D_{i,s,1}\tilde{J}_t|^2 \lambda^{j,\mathbb{Q}} ds\right) < \infty, \tag{25}$$

(iii) $\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_u^*)^{-1} D_u \tilde{J}_t \geq \tilde{J}_t$ *a.s for all* $u \leq t$,

(iv) If $\sigma_t^0 = \sigma_t^I = \sigma_t^C$, $\rho = \emptyset$. *Otherwise* $\rho = \{I, C\}$,

(When the underlying assets are not bonds, the diffusion term in the defaultable bonds will be ignored to remain in complete market. Then $\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_t^*)^{-1} D_t \tilde{Y}_t$ *does not hold* $\xi_t^i \tilde{P}_t^I$ *and* $\xi_t^C \tilde{P}_t^C$. *To avoid this difficulty, we impose a condition that defaultable bonds are gained from repo markets. In incomplete market this condition can be chosen flexibly.)*

(v) for $i \in \{I, C\}$, *when* $i \in \rho$, $b_t^i \leq \lambda^{i,\mathbb{Q}}$, *otherwise* $b_t^b \leq \lambda^{i,\mathbb{Q}}$

(A stronger condition which is easier to check is that $\tilde{f}(t, y, z, z^I, z^C)$ *is non-decreasing with respect to* z^I *and* z^C*),*

Then $\tilde{Y}_t$ *is a unique solution of the following linear BSDE:*

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{Y}_t =& \tilde{J}_t + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} b_s^b (\tilde{Y}_s - \sum_{i \in \rho^c} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i) - \sum_{i \in \rho} b_s^i \xi_s^i P_s^i ds \\ &+ \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i \sigma_s^i dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}} - \sum_{i \in \{I,C\}} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_{s-}^i z \tilde{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}(ds, dz). \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Proof. By Proposition 4 (in Appendix), (16) has a unique solution and Malliavin differentiable. Taking Malliavin derivative to (20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -D_u\tilde{Y}_t =& D_u\tilde{J}_t + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} (b_s^l \mathbb{1}_{\{K_s \geq 0\}} + b_s^b \mathbb{1}_{\{K_s < 0\}})(D_u\tilde{Y}_s - \sum_{i \in \rho^c} D_u(\xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i)) - \sum_{i \in \rho} b_s^i D_u(\xi_s^i P_s^i) ds \\ &+ \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} D_u(\xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i) \sigma_s^i dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}} - \sum_{i \in \{I,C\}} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} D_u(\xi_s^i \tilde{P}_{s-}^i) z \tilde{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}(ds, dz). \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Hence, $\tilde{Y}_t$ and $\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_u^*)^{-1} D_u \tilde{Y}_t$ follow the same BSDE. Therefore, the result is proved by comparison principle. □

We also have a linear equation when $\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_u^*)^{-1} D_u \tilde{J}_t \leq \tilde{J}_t$ a.s. Since (26) is linear, we can have an explicit solution of $\tilde{Y}_t$ in many cases (see Delong, 2013; Quenez & Sulem, 2013). Also, for the prototype of this argument which does not include jumps, readers can refer El Karoui et al. (1997). The application of a concrete XVA example can be found in Bichuch et al. (2015a). Even though explicit form is not available, the numerical approximation becomes forward from backward. In other words, we recover the same difficulties as classical pricing approach.

3.2.2 $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t = \tilde{V}_t$ and $\tilde{C}_t = \gamma \tilde{V}_t$ where $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$.

In this chapter, we write

$$\tilde{J}_t = -\int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} (B_s^D)^{-1} dA_s^c \tag{28}$$

By (21) and (22), we consider

$$\begin{aligned}
-\tilde{V}_t =& \tilde{J}_t - \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \lambda^{\mathbb{Q}} \tilde{V}_s ds \\
&+ \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} (\mathbb{1}_{K\geq 0} b_s^l + \mathbb{1}_{K<0} b_s^b) \left(\tilde{V}_s(1-\gamma) - \sum_{i\in\rho} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i \right) - \sum_{i\in\rho^c} b_s^i \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i ds \\
&+ \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \lambda^{I,\mathbb{Q}} L_I (1-\gamma) \tilde{V}_s^+ - \lambda^{C,\mathbb{Q}} L_C (1-\gamma) \tilde{V}_s^- ds \\
&+ \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} b_s^{c,l} \tilde{V}_s^+ - b_s^{c,b} \tilde{V}_s^- ds + \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i \sigma_s^i dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}} \\
=& \tilde{J}_t + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} (\mathbb{1}_{K\geq 0} b_s^l + \mathbb{1}_{K<0} b_s^b) \left(\tilde{V}_s(1-\gamma) - \sum_{i\in\rho} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i \right) - \sum_{i\in\rho^c} b_s^i \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i ds \\
&+ \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} a_s^1 \tilde{V}_s^+ - a_s^2 \tilde{V}_s^- ds + \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i \sigma_s^i dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}},
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where , $a_t^1 = \lambda^{I,\mathbb{Q}} L_I (1-\gamma) + b_t^{c,l} - \lambda^{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $a_t^2 = \lambda^{C,\mathbb{Q}} L_C (1-\gamma) + b_t^{c,b} - \lambda^{\mathbb{Q}}$. Note that both a_t^1 and a_t^2 are deterministic. The terminal condition, $\tilde{J}_t$ is simpler than the previous case, so we may remove one of $\mathbb{1}_{K\geq 0}$ or $\mathbb{1}_{K<0}$ easily, but other semi-linear term, $a_t^1 \tilde{V}_t^+ - a_t^2 \tilde{V}_t^-$ will still remain. To overcome this difficulty, let us introduce a simple lemma. (For the definition of solution spaces, see the Appendix.)

Lemma 2. *Consider the following BSDE:*

$$-\tilde{V}_t = \tilde{\zeta} + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} a_s^1 \tilde{V}_s^+ - a_s^2 \tilde{V}_s^- ds + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \tilde{Z}_s dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}}. \tag{30}$$

Assume $\zeta \leq 0$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\bar{\tau}}$ and a_t^i are processes that makes the generator standard. Then $\tilde{V}_t \geq 0$.

Proof. Let us consider the following BSDEs

$$-\tilde{V}'_t = \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} a_s^1 \tilde{V}_s'^+ - a_s^2 \tilde{V}_s'^- ds + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \tilde{Z}'_s dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}}. \tag{31}$$

Then $(\tilde{V}'_t, \tilde{Z}'_t) = (0,0)$ is the unique solution of (31). Therefore, proof is done by applying comparison principle to (30) and (31). □

Proposition 3. *Let $t < \tau$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ an equivalent martingale measure with B_t^D as the numéraire. Assume*

(i) $\tilde{J}_t \in \mathbb{D}_{1,2}$ *for all* $t \in [0, \bar{\tau}]$,

(ii) for all $t \in [0, \bar{\tau}]$, $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$, $i, j \in \{I, C\}$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\int_0^{\bar{\tau}} |D_{k,s} \tilde{J}_t|^2 ds \right) < \infty, \tag{32}$$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\int_0^{\bar{\tau}} |D_{i,s,1} \tilde{J}_t|^2 \lambda^{j,\mathbb{Q}} ds \right) < \infty, \tag{33}$$

(iii) $\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_u^*)^{-1} D_u \tilde{J}_t \geq (1-\gamma)\tilde{J}_t$ *a.s for all* $u \leq t$,

(iv) $\tilde{J}_t \leq 0$, $d\mathbb{Q} \otimes dt$, *a.s.*

(v) If $\sigma_t^0 = \sigma_t^I = \sigma_t^C$, $\rho = \emptyset$. *Otherwise* $\rho = \{I, C\}$,

Then $\tilde{V}_t$ is a unique solution of the following linear BSDE,

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{V}_t =& \tilde{J}_t + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} b_s^l \left(\tilde{V}_s(1-\gamma) - \sum_{i \in \rho} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i \right) - \sum_{i \in \rho^c} b_s^i \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i + a_s^1 \tilde{V}_s ds \\ &+ \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i \sigma_s^i dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}}, \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where $a_t^1 = \lambda^{I,\mathbb{Q}} L_I (1-\gamma) + b_t^{c,l} - \lambda^{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Proof. This can be proved by similar argument as in Proposition 3. □

We also recover a linear equation when $\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_u^*)^{-1} D_u \tilde{J}_t \leq (1-\gamma)\tilde{J}_t$ or $\tilde{J}_t \geq 0$, a.s.

4 Examples.

Now we are in a position to explore some examples. If a linear BSDE is recovered, we have same difficulties with classical pricing theory. In other words, in a case that explicit representation of solution is available in classical setup, it is also possible under XVA.

4.1 $\varepsilon_t = B_t \mathbb{E}(\int_{t+}^{T} B_s^{-1} dA_s^c | \mathcal{F}_t)$ and $C_t = \gamma \varepsilon_t$, where $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$.

In what follows, we denote

$$\tilde{J}_t^1 := \tilde{C}_t - \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} (B_s^D)^{-1} dA_s, \tag{35}$$

$$\Lambda := 1 - \mathbb{1}_{\tau^C \leq T \wedge \tau^I} L_C (1-\gamma) \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon_\tau < 0} - \mathbb{1}_{\tau^I \leq T \wedge \tau^C} L_I (1-\gamma) \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon_\tau \geq 0}. \tag{36}$$

Hence, $\tilde{J}_t^1 = \gamma \tilde{\varepsilon}_t - \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} (B_s^D)^{-1} dA_s^c - \mathbb{1}_{T \leq \tau} \Lambda \tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau$. Note that $\gamma - \Lambda \leq 0$

Example 1 (Forward contract on a stock). *We assume*

- *The assets follow the following dynamics*

$$\begin{aligned} dS_t &= r_t S_t dt + \sigma S_t dW_t \\ dP_t^I &= r_t P_t^I dt - P_{t-}^I dM_t^I \\ dP_t^C &= r_t P_t^C dt - P_{t-}^C dM_t^C, \end{aligned}$$

  where r_t is deterministic and σ is constant,

- $A_t^c = \mathbb{1}_{[T]}(t)(S_T - \kappa)$.

- *the two defaultable bonds are gained from repo markets with interest rates, r_t^I and r_t^C. In other words, we will assume the generator function of (12),*

- $r_t^{c,l} \leq r_t = r_t^{c,b}$ *(or* $\gamma = 0$*),*

  (This condition is to deal with collateral. If collateral is not involved, namely $\gamma = 0$*, we do not need to consider this condition.)*

- $r_t^i \leq \lambda^i + r_t$ *for* $i \in \{I, C\}$.

Then $\tilde{Y}_t$ *is a unique solution of a linear BSDE.*

Proof. Proof. Since $\sigma^{-1} D_t \tilde{J}_t^1 = \gamma \tilde{S}_t - \mathbb{1}_{\tau > T} \tilde{S}_T - \mathbb{1}_{\tau \leq T} \Lambda \tilde{S}_\tau$, we have

$$\sigma^{-1} D_t \tilde{J}_t^1 - \tilde{J}_t^1 = \tilde{\kappa}(\gamma - \mathbb{1}_{\tau > T} - \mathbb{1}_{\tau \leq T} \Lambda) \leq 0 \quad a.s. \tag{37}$$

Also $\sigma^{-1} D_t \tilde{m}_t - \tilde{m}_t = \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{C}_t \geq 0} b^{c,l} \gamma \tilde{\kappa} \leq 0$, a.s. Therefore, $K_t \leq 0$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. Let us change to equivalent probability $\mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} dS_t &= r_t^b S_t dt + \sigma S_t dW_t^{\mathbb{Q}} \\ dP_t^I &= r_t^I P_t^I dt - P_{t-}^I dM_t^{\mathbb{Q},I} \\ dP_t^C &= r_t^C P_t^C dt - P_{t-}^C dM_t^{\mathbb{Q},C}, \end{aligned}$$

which means $\lambda^{\mathbb{Q},i} = \lambda^i + r_t^i - r_t$. Hence, noting that $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ are equivalent, $\tilde{Y}_t$ is the solution of the linear BSDE with $B_t^D = B_t^b$:

$$-\tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{J}_t + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s \tilde{S}_s \sigma dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}} - \sum_{i \in \{I,C\}} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i z \tilde{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}(ds, dz) \tag{38}$$

□

The last condition about collateral rate is mild since the interest rate paid for collateral is often based on Federal funds rate.

Example 2 (Interest rate swap)**.** *Let us consider an interest rate swap with contract maturity* T *and tenors* T_i*,* $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$*. In this example, by* δ_i*, we mean the tenor between* T_{i-1} *and* T_i*. In addition we assume the followings.*

- *The assets follow (1) and (2). Here,* P_t^0 *and* P_t^i *mean the bond prices with maturity* T *and* T_i *at* $t \in [0, T]$.

- $A_t^c = \mathbb{1}_{[T]}(t)\Phi(P_T) = \mathbb{1}_{[T]}(t)(1 - P_T^d - \kappa \sum_{i=1}^{d} \delta_i P_T^i)$. *Therefore,*

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_t = \tilde{P}_t^0 - \tilde{P}_t^d - \kappa \sum_{i=1}^{d} \delta_i \tilde{P}_t^i. \tag{39}$$

- *We consider asset process of (1) with a constant volatility $\sigma_t = \sigma$. If short rate process, r_t, follows the dynamics: $dr_t = \beta(t, r_t)dt + \sigma^r dW_t$, where $\beta : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, σ^r is assumed to satisfy the condition that*

$$1 + \mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma)^{-1} \int_t^T (\sigma^r)^* ds \leq 0, \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{40}$$

Then $\tilde{Y}_t$ is a solution of a linear BSDE.

Remark 3. *In the third condition, If r_t follows one dimensional Vasicek model with mean reverting coefficient a and constant volatility the condition is satisfied since*

$$1 + (\sigma^*)^{-1} \int_t^T \sigma^r ds = 1 - \frac{a(T-t)}{1 - e^{-a(T-t)}} \leq 0. \tag{41}$$

Proof. We take $B_t^D = B_t^b$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ as the equivalent martingale measure of B_t^b. Since $r_t^l \leq r_t^b$, $\tilde{f}_t$ is non-decreasing with respect to $\xi^I P^I$ and $\xi^C P^C$. Also, for $t \leq s$

$$\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_t^*)^{-1} D_t \tilde{\varepsilon}_s = \tilde{\varepsilon}_s,$$
$$D_t \tilde{1} = \tilde{1}(-\textstyle\int_t^T (\sigma^r)^* ds),$$
$$\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_t^*)^{-1} D_t(-\tilde{P}_s^d - \kappa \sum_{i=1}^{d} \delta_i \tilde{P}_s^i) = -\tilde{P}_s^d - \kappa \sum_{i=1}^{d} \delta_i \tilde{P}_s^i.$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_t^*)^{-1} D_t \tilde{J}_t^1 - \tilde{J}_t^1 = \mathbb{1}_{\tau > T}(1 + \mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_t^*)^{-1} \textstyle\int_t^T \sigma_s^r ds)\tilde{1} \leq 0. \tag{42}$$

$$\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_t^*)^{-1} D_t \tilde{m}_t - \tilde{m}_t = 0 \tag{43}$$

□

The condition to make the problem linear is comparison of terminal condition, $\mathbb{1} \cdot (\sigma_u^*)^{-1} D_u \tilde{J}_t \geq$

$\tilde{J}_t$. However, one difficulty here is that in terminal condition, there are two elements having opposite effect in the comparison, the payoff function and collateral. It was rather easy to handle this difficulty in the above two examples since they had linear payoffs. One trivial case to retrieve a linear BSDE is that $C_t = 0$ (or $\gamma = 0$), but is meaningless and not practical. To avoid the different tendency in the terminal process, the BSDE of $\tilde{V}_t$ will be used. However, we then encounter the generator holding $\tilde{C}_t$ which is exogenous. Nonetheless, we still can obtain linear BSDEs when, $C_t \geq 0$ or $C_t \leq 0$ for $t \in [0, T]$, which is true for many typical type of derivative. In what follows, by $c(t, x_t)$ and $p(t, x_t)$, we mean the solution of call option and put option of exercise price κ with deterministic interest rate and volatility, r_t and σ_t, in Black-Scholes-Merton model. Namely, $\tilde{c}(t, x_t) = \tilde{x}_t n(d_1) - \tilde{\kappa} n(d_2)$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
n(x) &= \textstyle\int_{-\infty}^{x} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{y^2}{2}} dy \\
d_1 &= \frac{\log(x_t/\kappa) + \int_t^T r_s ds + \frac{\hat{\sigma}_t^2}{2}(T-t)}{\hat{\sigma}_t \sqrt{T-t}} \\
d_2 &= d_1 - \hat{\sigma}_t \sqrt{T-t} \\
\hat{\sigma}_t &= \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{T-t} \textstyle\int_t^T \sigma_s^2 ds}
\end{aligned}
$$

Example 3 (Call option on a stock)**.** *We assume*

- *The assets follow the dynamics:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
dS_t &= r_t S_t dt + \sigma S_t W_t \\
dP_t^I &= r_t P^I dt - P_{t-}^I dM_t^I \\
dP_t^C &= r_t P_t^C dt - P_{t-}^C dM_t^C,
\end{aligned}
$$

  under a new probability, $\mathbb{Q}$*.*

- $A_t^c = \mathbb{1}_{[T]}(t)(S_T - \kappa)^+$*. Therefore,* $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t = \tilde{c}(t, S_t)$

- *The two defaultable bonds are gained from repo markets by interest rates,* r_t^I *and* r_t^C*. In other words, we will assume the generator function of (13)*

- $r_t^{c,l} \leq r_t^l \leq r_t^b$.

- $r_t^i < \lambda^i + r_t$ *for* $i \in \{I, C\}$.

Then $\tilde{Y}_t$ is a unique solution of a linear BSDE.

Proof. Choose $\mathbb{Q}$ with the numéraire B_t^l. Let us recall the BSDE of $\tilde{V}_t$,

$$-\tilde{V}_t = \tilde{J}_t + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \tilde{f}_s ds + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s \tilde{S}_s \sigma dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}} - \sum_{i\in\{I,C\}} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i z \tilde{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}(ds,dz), \tag{44}$$

where $\tilde{f}_t = \mathbb{1}_{K_t<0} b_t^b(\tilde{V}_t - \tilde{C}_t - \xi_t\tilde{S}_t) - b_s^I \tilde{P}_t^I - b_t^C \tilde{P}_t^C$, and the terminal process, $\tilde{J}_t$, satisfies that $\tilde{J}_t = -\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau>T\}}(\tilde{S}_T - \tilde{\kappa})^+ - \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\le T\}}\Lambda\tilde{\varepsilon}_\tau + \int_t^{\bar{\tau}} \tilde{m}_s ds$. Then, as in the first example of forward contract, $\sigma^{-1}D_t\tilde{J}_t \le \tilde{J}_t$, $d\mathbb{P}\otimes dt$ a.s. Moreover,

$$\sigma^{-1}D_t\tilde{f}_t - \tilde{f}_t = \mathbb{1}_{K_t<0} b_t^b(-\sigma^{-1}D_t\tilde{C}_t + \tilde{C}_t) = \mathbb{1}_{K_t<0} b_t^b(-\gamma\tilde{\kappa}n(d_2)) \le 0, \quad d\mathbb{P}\otimes dt \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{45}$$

Therefore, $\tilde{V}_t \le \xi_t\tilde{S}_t \le \xi_t\tilde{S}_t + \tilde{C}_t$ a.s, so we can recover the linear generator that

$$\tilde{f}_t = b_t^b(\tilde{V}_t - \tilde{C}_t - \xi_t\tilde{S}_t) - b_t^I\xi_t^I\tilde{P}_t^I - b_t^C\xi_t^C\tilde{P}_t^C. \tag{46}$$

□

In case of short position of put option, we may price it by short position of call option and long position of forward contract. Then the summation of the two price should be in the arbitrage free interval. However, it may not be exactly the sell price of the put option. The another covenants, $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t = \tilde{V}_t$, is more flexible in option cases.

4.2 $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t = \tilde{V}_t$ and $\tilde{C}_t = \gamma\tilde{\varepsilon}_t$, where $0 \le \gamma \le 1$.

Now we denote $\tilde{J}_t = -\int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} (B_s^D)^{-1} dA_s^c$

Example 4 (Put option on a stock)**.** *We assume*

- *P_t^I and P_t^C are gained from repo markets by interest rates, r_t^I and r_t^C.*

- *The assets follow the dynamics:*

$$\begin{aligned} dS_t =& r_t^l S_t dt + \sigma S_t W_t^{\mathbb{Q}} \\ dP_t^I =& r_t^I P_t^I dt - P_{t-}^I dM_t^{I,\mathbb{Q}} \\ dP_t^C =& r_t^C P_t^C dt - P_{t-}^C dM_t^{C,\mathbb{Q}}, \end{aligned}$$

  under a new probability, $\mathbb{Q}$.

- $A_t^c = \mathbb{1}_{[T]}(t)(\kappa - S_T)^+$. *Therefore,* $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t = \tilde{c}(t, S_t)$

- $r_t^{c,l} \leq r_t^l \leq r_t^b$.

Then $\tilde{V}_t$ *is a unique solution of a linear BSDE. Especially,*

$$e^{-\int_0^t a_s^1 ds}\tilde{V}_t = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} e^{-\int_0^s a_u^1 du}(B_s^l)^{-1} dA_s^c | \mathcal{G}_t\right), \tag{47}$$

Proof. Taking $B_t^D = B_t^l$, $\sigma^{-1}D_t\tilde{J}_t - (1-\gamma)\tilde{J}_t \geq 0$ and $\tilde{J}_t \leq 0$. By the same argument as in Proposition 3, $K_t \geq 0$ a.s. Therefore, $\tilde{V}_t$ is a unique solution of the following linear BSDE,

$$-\tilde{V}_t = \tilde{J}_t + \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} a_s^1 \tilde{V}_s ds + \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s^i \tilde{P}_s^i \sigma_s^i dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}}, \tag{48}$$

where $a_t^1 = \lambda^{I,\mathbb{Q}} L_I(1-\gamma) + b_t^{c,l} - \lambda^{\mathbb{Q}}$. Let us denote $e^{-\int_0^t a_s^1 ds}\tilde{X}_t$ by $\bar{X}_t$ for all process. Changing probability to $\mathbb{Q}$ and applying Itô's formula to $\bar{V}_t$, we have

$$-\bar{V}_t = -\int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} e^{-\int_0^s a_u^1 du}(B_s^l)^{-1} dA_s^c + \sum_{i=0}^{d+2} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \xi_s^i \bar{P}_s^i \sigma_s^i dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}}. \tag{49}$$

□

Lastly, we will deal with a non-Markovian case.

Example 5 (Floating strike Asian call option)**.** *We assume*

- *The assets follow the dynamics:*

$$\begin{aligned} dS_t =& r_t^l S_t dt + \sigma S_t W_t^{\mathbb{Q}} \\ dP_t^I =& r_t^I P_t^I dt - P_{t-}^I dM_t^{I,\mathbb{Q}} \\ dP_t^C =& r_t^C P_t^C dt - P_{t-}^C dM_t^{C,\mathbb{Q}}, \end{aligned}$$

  under a new probability, $\mathbb{Q}$.

- $A_t^c = \mathbb{1}_{[T]}\Phi(S_T) = \mathbb{1}_{[T]}(t)(S_T - \kappa A(0,T))^+$ *where* $A(0,T) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \ln(S_u)du\right)$

- *The two defaultable bonds are gained from repo markets by interest rates,* r_t^I *and* r_t^C*. In other words, we will assume the generator function of. (13)*

- $r_t^{c,l} \leq r_t^l \leq r_t \leq r_t^b$.

Then $\tilde{V}_t$ *is a unique solution of a linear BSDE.*

Proof. Choose $B_t^D = B_t^l$ and equivalent probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ of a numéraire B_t^l. Since $\sigma^{-1}D_t A(0,T) = A(0,T)\frac{T-t}{T}$,

$$\sigma^{-1}D_t\Phi(\tilde{S}_T) - \Phi(\tilde{S}_T) = \mathbb{1}_{S_T \geq \kappa\tilde{A}(0,T)}\left(-\kappa\frac{t}{T}A(0,T)\right) \geq 0. \tag{50}$$

Therefore, $\sigma^{-1}D_t\tilde{\varepsilon}_s - \tilde{\varepsilon}_s \geq 0$ and $\sigma^{-1}D_t\tilde{m}_s - \tilde{m}_s = \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{C}_s \geq 0} b_s^{c,l}\left(\sigma^{-1}D_t\tilde{\varepsilon}_s - \tilde{\varepsilon}_s\right) \leq 0$, a.s for $t \leq s$. Hence $K_t \leq 0$ and $\tilde{V}_t \geq 0$, $d\mathbb{P} \otimes dt$ a.s. □

Once we have linear BSDEs, pricing under XVA will have same difficulty in classical pricing framework. In other words, if we can compute the price explicitly in classical setting, we can also do so in XVA. We will find the explicit solution of Example 4 as an example. For simplicity we assume all parameters are constant and $r = r^l$. Recalling $\mathbb{Q}$ defined in Example 4, since $r = r^l$, for $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random variable χ, $\mathbb{E}(\chi|\mathcal{F}_t) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}(\chi|\mathcal{F}_t)$. The solution of Example 4 is

$$V_t = e^{-(a^1+\lambda^{\mathbb{Q}})(T-t)}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}(e^{-r(T-t)}(\kappa - S_T)^+|\mathcal{F}_t), \tag{51}$$

where $a^1 = \lambda^{I,\mathbb{Q}} L_I(1-\gamma) + (r^{c,l} - r) - \lambda^{\mathbb{Q}}$. Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_t &= e^{-\phi(T-t)} p(t, S_t), \qquad (52)\\
\phi &= \left(\lambda^I + r - r^I\right) L_I(1-\gamma) + (r^{c,l} - r),\\
p(t, S_t) &= \kappa e^{-r(T-t)} n(-d_t^2) - S_t n(-d_t^1),\\
n(y) &= \int_{-\infty}^{y} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{z^2}{2}} dz,\\
d_t^1 &= \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{T-t}} \left(\ln\left(\frac{S_t}{\kappa}\right) + \left(r + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)(T-t) \right),\\
d_t^2 &= d_1 - \sigma\sqrt{T-t},\\
\xi_t &= -e^{-\phi(T-t)} n(-d_t^1), \qquad (53)\\
\xi_t^I &= (P_t^I)^{-1} L_I(1-\gamma) e^{-\phi(T-t)} p(t, S_t). \qquad (54)
\end{aligned}
$$

In addition, $CVA_t = 0$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
DVA_t &= L_I(\gamma-1) e^{\lambda t} B_t \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{t<\tau^I \le \tau^C \wedge T} L_I B_\tau^{-1} V_\tau^+ | \mathcal{G}_t)\\
&= L_I(\gamma-1) e^{\lambda t} B_t \int_t^T \lambda^I e^{-\lambda u} \mathbb{E}(B_u^{-1} V_u | \mathcal{F}_t) du\\
&= L_I(\gamma-1) e^{\lambda t} B_t \int_t^T \lambda^I e^{-\lambda u} e^{-\phi(T-u)} \mathbb{E}\left(B_u^{-1} B_u^l \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left((\tilde{\kappa} - \tilde{S}_T)^+ | \mathcal{F}_u\right) | \mathcal{F}_t\right) du\\
&= L_I(\gamma-1) e^{\lambda t} B_t \int_t^T \lambda^I e^{-\lambda u} e^{-\phi(T-u)} \mathbb{E}\left((\tilde{\kappa} - \tilde{S}_T)^+ | \mathcal{F}_u\right) du\\
&= L_I(\gamma-1) e^{\lambda t - \phi T} \lambda^I p(t, S_t) \int_t^T e^{(\phi-\lambda)u} du\\
&= L_I(\gamma-1) e^{\lambda t - \phi T} \lambda^I p(t, S_t) \frac{1}{\phi - \lambda} \left(e^{(\phi-\lambda)T} - e^{(\phi-\lambda)t} \right) \qquad (55)
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
MCA_t &= (r - r^{c,l}) \gamma e^{\lambda t - \phi T} p(t, S_t) \int_t^T e^{(\phi-\lambda)u} du\\
&= (r - r^{c,l}) \gamma e^{\lambda t - \phi T} p(t, S_t) \frac{1}{\phi - \lambda} \left(e^{(\phi-\lambda)T} - e^{(\phi-\lambda)t} \right) \qquad (56)
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 1a is how DVA changes with default risk. Main factor in DVA is λ^I. λ^C also influences DVA since it affects to the average time to terminate the contract. The traders can hedge DVA by buying



(a) DVA (b) ξ_t^I

Figure 1: We set $S_0 = \kappa = 1$, $\sigma = 0.3$, $T = 2$, $L_I = 0.6$, $r^I = 0.05$, $r^{c,l} = 0.03$, $r = r^l = 0.05$. In the left graph, $\gamma = 0.5$. In the right graph, $\lambda^C = 0.01$.



(a) MCA (b) MCA with λ^I

Figure 2: We set $S_0 = \kappa = 1$, $\sigma = 0.3$, $T = 2$, $L_I = 0.6$, $r^I = 0.05$. In the left graph, $\gamma = 0.5$, $\lambda^I = \lambda^C = 0.01$. In the right graph, $r = 0.05$, $r^{c,l} = 0.03$, $\lambda^C = 0.01$

back their bonds. Figure 1b shows change of hedge ratio according to λ^I. The higher γ is, the more sensitive against its own default risk the trader is. Figure 2a shows how MCA changes according to r and $r^{c,l}$. Quite naturally, main contribution to MCA is the spread between r and $r^{c,l}$. Default risk is a factor to MCA since it determines the period which margin cost is inflicted to the trader.

In our analysis, default risk and interest rate impact on XVA comprehensively. Market participants may not realize fluctuation of λ^i. However, the default parameters are actually sensitive to regulation Chung et al. (2015). Therefore, our analysis suggests traders to adjust their hedge ratio considering regulation as well as traded assets prices.

5 Conclusion.

We investigated conditions to make XVA pricing problem linear. As it is shown in the examples, the conditions are satisfied under realistic covenants. One important condition is the comparison of terminal process. The main result of this paper is applicable to many typical derivatives. The importance of this result is also from practical reason that the naive numerical approach to BSDE shows non-negligible error in some cases (see appendix B). Therefore, possible further research is finding a delicate numerical scheme for XVA or a way to apply our main results more generally.

A BSDEs.

We will recover existence, uniqueness, comparison principle and Malliavin differentiability of the BSDE

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t =& \phi + \int_t^{\bar{\tau}} f(w, s, Y_s, Z_s, Z_s^I, Z_s^C) ds \\ & - \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} Z_s dW^{\mathbb{Q}}(s) - \sum_{i \in \{I,C\}} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} Z_s^i(z) \tilde{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}(dz, ds), \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

where $\phi = \eta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\tau > T} + \eta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\tau \leq T}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ is an equivalent martingale measure. To make use of results in BSDEs with jumps, we will deal with another BSDE equivalent up to $\bar{\tau}$, by defining indistinguishable jump measures with $\mu^i, i \in \{I, C\}$. The idea is taken from the appendix in Bichuch et al. (2015a). For the definition of Malliavin derivative, readers can refer Di Nunno et al. (2009).

We start with defining the following spaces of random variable and stochastic process:

- $\mathbb{L}_t^2(\mathbb{R})$, the space of all $\mathcal{G}_t$-measurable random variables $X : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|X\|^2 = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}(|X|^2) < \infty$.
- $\mathbb{H}_t^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$, the space of all predictable processes $Z : \Omega \times [0, t] \to \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\int_0^t |Z_s|^2 ds \right] < \infty. \tag{58}$$

- $\mathbb{H}^2_{\nu,t}(\mathbb{R})$, the space of all predictable processes $Z : \Omega \times [0,t] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} |Z_s(z)|^2 \nu(dz)ds\right] < \infty. \tag{59}$$

- $\mathbb{S}^2_t$, the space of all càdlàg processes $Y : \Omega \times [0,t] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\sup_{s\in[0,t]} |Y_s|^2\right] < \infty \tag{60}$$

Let $\hat{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}(dt,dz)$ be compensated Poisson random measure on $(\Omega, \mathbb{G}, \mathbb{P})$ with compensators $\nu^i(dz)dt := \lambda^{i,\mathbb{Q}}\delta_1(dz)dt$. By uniqueness of compensator, $\tilde{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\hat{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}$ are indistinguishable up to τ. We set

$$\hat{\mathbb{G}} = \mathbb{F} \vee \hat{\mathbb{H}}^I \vee \hat{\mathbb{H}}^C,$$
$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}^i = (\mathcal{H}^i_t)_{t\in[0,T]} = \sigma(\hat{\mu}^i(A,[0,u]), u \le t, A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})), \quad \text{for} \quad i \in \{I,C\},$$
$$\hat{\tau}^i = \inf\{t \ge 0 | \Delta\hat{\mu}^i(\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\},[0,t]) = 1\} \quad \text{for} \quad i \in \{I,C\},$$
$$\hat{\tau} = \hat{\tau}^I \wedge \hat{\tau}^C \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\tau}' = \hat{\tau} \wedge T,$$
$$\hat{f}_t = f_t \mathbb{1}_{t\le\hat{\tau}'},$$
$$\hat{\phi} = \eta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\hat{\tau}>T} + \eta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\hat{\tau}\le T}.$$

Then, rather than (57), we will deal with

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{Y}_t =& \hat{\phi} + \int_t^T \hat{f}(w,s,\hat{Y}_s,\hat{Z}_s,\hat{Z}^I_s,\hat{Z}^C_s)ds \\ &- \int_{t+}^T \hat{Z}_s dW^{\mathbb{Q}}(s) - \sum_{i\in\{I,C\}} \int_{t+}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} \hat{Z}^i_s(z)\hat{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}(dz,ds).\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Proposition 4. *Assume that*

(i) $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{L}^2_T(\mathbb{R})$ *and* $\eta_2 \in \mathbb{L}^2_\tau(\mathbb{R})$

(ii) $f : \Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{d+4} \to \mathbb{R}$ *is predictable and there is* $K > 0$ *such that for all* $(y_1,z_1,z_1^I,z_1^C),(y_2,z_2,z_2^I,z_2^C) \in$

$\mathbb{R}^{d+4}$

$$|f(w,t,y_1,z_1,z_1^I,z_1^C) - f(w,t,y_2,z_2,z_2^I,z_2^C)| \\ < K(|y_1-y_2| + \|z_1-z_2\| + |z_1^I - z_2^I| + |z_1^C - z_2^C|), \tag{62}$$

$d\mathbb{Q}\otimes dt$ *a.s.*

(iii) There is a constant K such that

$$f(w,t,y,z,z_1^I,z^C) - f(w,t,y,z,z_2^I,z^C) \le K(z_1^I - z_2^I)^+ + \lambda^{I,\mathbb{Q}}(z_1^I - z_2^I)^-, \tag{63}$$

$$f(w,t,y,z,z^I,z_1^C) - f(w,t,y,z,z^I,z_2^C) \le K(z_1^C - z_2^C)^+ + \lambda^{C,\mathbb{Q}}(z_1^C - z_2^C)^-, \tag{64}$$

$d\mathbb{Q}\otimes dt$, *a.s.*

(iv) $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\int_0^T |f(t,0,0,0,0)|^2\right] < \infty$.

Then we obtain the following two results.

- *(57) has a unique solution* $(Y,Z,Z^I,Z^C) \in \mathbb{S}_\tau \times \mathbb{H}_\tau(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \times \mathbb{H}_{\nu^I,\tau} \times \mathbb{H}_{\nu^C,\tau}$,
- *Let* (f^1,η_1^1,η_2^1) *and* (f^2,η_1^2,η_2^2) *be generators and terminal conditions satisfying the above condition and* Y_t^1 *and* Y_t^2 *the above conditions. Assume* $\eta_1^1 \ge \eta_1^2$, $\eta_2^1 \ge \eta_2^2$ *and* $f^1(t,y,z,z_1^I,z^C) \ge f^2(t,y,z,z_1^I,z^C)$ *for all* $(t,y,z,z_1^I,z^C) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{d+4}$. *Then* $Y_{t\wedge\bar\tau}^1 \ge Y_{t\wedge\bar\tau}^2$ *for all* $t\in[0,T]$, *a.s.*

Proof. (61) has a unique solution and the restriction of the unique solution on $\{t \le \hat\tau'\}$ is the unique solution of (57). □

Malliavin derivative of jump, $D_{i,t,z}$ for $i \in \{I,C\}$, is defined respect to the compensated Poisson random measure, $\hat\mu^{i,\mathbb{Q}}$.

Proposition 5. *Let* $t \le \tau$. *Assume that*

(i) $\phi \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ *and for all* $k = \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$, $i, j \in \{I, C\}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}_0$ *satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\int_0^{\bar{\tau}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} |D_{i,t,z}\phi|^2 \nu^j(dz)dt\right] < \infty, \tag{65}$$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\int_0^{\bar{\tau}} |D_{k,t}\phi|^2 dt\right] < \infty, \tag{66}$$

$$\lim_{\beta \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\int_0^{\bar{\tau}} \int_{|z| \leq \beta} |D_{i,t,z}\phi|^2 \nu^j(dz)dt\right] = 0, \tag{67}$$

(ii) $f : \Omega \times [0, \bar{\tau}] \times \mathbb{R}^{d+4} \to \mathbb{R}$ *is predictable and there is* $K > 0$ *such that for all* $(y_1, z_1, z_1^I, z_1^C), (y_2, z_2, z_2^I, z_2^C) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+4}$

$$\begin{aligned} &|f(w, t, y_1, z_1, z_1^I, z_1^C) - f(w, t, y_2, z_2, z_2^I, z_2^C)| \\ &\qquad < K(|y_1 - y_2| + \|z_1 - z_2\| + |z_1^I - z_2^I| + |z_1^C - z_2^C|), \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

$d\mathbb{Q} \otimes dt$ *a.s,*

(iii) the mapping $(y, z, z_1, z_2) \mapsto f(t, y, z, z^I, z^C)$ *is continuously differentiable with uniformly bounded and continuous partial derivatives,* $f_y, \nabla_z f, f_{z^I}, f_{z^C}$, $d\mathbb{Q} \otimes dt$ *a.s,*

(iv) for each (t, y, z, z^I, z^C), $f(\omega, t, y, z, z^I, z^C) \in \mathbb{D}_{1,2}$, *and for all* $k = \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$, $i, j \in \{I, C\}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}_0$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\int_0^{\bar{\tau}} \int_0^{\bar{\tau}} |D_{k,s} f(\omega, t, 0, 0, 0, 0)|^2 dtds\right] < \infty, \tag{69}$$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\int_{[0,\bar{\tau}]\times\mathbb{R}_0} \left(\int_0^{\bar{\tau}} |D_{i,s,z} f(\omega, t, 0, 0, 0, 0)|^2 dt\right) \nu^j(dz)ds\right] < \infty, \tag{70}$$

(v) for all $(y_1, z_1, z_1^I, z_1^C), (y_2, z_2, z_2^I, z_2^C) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+4}$, $k = \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$, $i \in \{I, C\}$, $dt \otimes d\nu^i$ *a.s* $(s, z) \in$

$[0, \bar{\tau}] \times \mathbb{R}_0$, *there exists* $K > 0$ *such that*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|D_{k,s}f(w,t,y_1,z_1,z_1^I,z_1^C) - D_{k,s}f(w,t,y_2,z_2,z_2^I,z_2^C)| \\
&\qquad < K(|y_1 - y_2| + \|z_1 - z_2\| + |z_1^I - z_2^I| + |z_1^C - z_2^C|), \qquad (71) \\
&|D_{i,s,z}f(w,t,y_1,z_1,z_1^I,z_1^C) - D_{i,s,z}f(w,t,y_2,z_2,z_2^I,z_2^C)| \\
&\qquad < K(|y_1 - y_2| + \|z_1 - z_2\| + |z_1^I - z_2^I| + |z_1^C - z_2^C|), \qquad (72)
\end{aligned}
$$

$d\mathbb{Q} \otimes dt$ *a.s,*

Then we have the following results:

- *There exists a unique solution* $(Y, Z, Z^I, Z^C) \in \mathbb{S}^2_\tau \times \mathbb{H}^2_\tau(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \times \mathbb{H}^2_{\nu^I,\tau} \times \mathbb{H}^2_{\nu^C,\tau}$ *to the BSDE (57),*
- *For all* $k = \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$, *there exists a unique solution* $(Y^{s,k}, Z^{s,k}, Z^{I,s,k}, Z^{C,s,k}) \in \mathbb{S}^2_\tau \times \mathbb{H}^2_\tau(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \times \mathbb{H}^2_{\nu^I,\tau} \times \mathbb{H}^2_{\nu^C,\tau}$, *to the BSDE*

$$
Y_t^{s,k} = D_{s,k}\phi + \int_t^{\bar{\tau}} D_{s,k}f_r dr - \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} Z_r^{s,k} dW_r^{\mathbb{Q}} - \sum_{i\in\{I,C\}} \int_{t+}^{\bar{\tau}} Z_r^{i,s,k} \hat{\mu}^{i,\mathbb{Q}}(dz, dr), \qquad (73)
$$

- $(Y^{s,k}, Z^{s,k}, Z^{I,s,k}, Z^{C,s,k})$ *is a version of Malliavin derivative* $(D_{s,k}Y_t, D_{s,k}Z_t, D_{s,k}Z_t^I, D_{s,k}Z_t^C)$. *Also, the predictable projection of* $D_{t,k}Y_t$ *is a version of* Z_t^k *(*k*-th component of* Z_t*) and the predictable projection of* $D_{i,t,z}Y_t$ *is a version of* $Z_t^i(z)$, *for* $i \in \{I, C\}$.

Proof. We apply theorem 3.5.1 in Delong (2013) to (61). By uniqueness of both BSDE, (57) and (61), this theorem hold up to $\bar{\tau}$. □

B Pitfall of plain numerical algorithm for BSDEs.

In this section, we implement typical numerical algorithm to the case of a call option on a stock without considering default risk and collateral. Then the price of call option follows a linear BSDE which is not affected by r and r^l. However, as we will see later, a naive application of numerical scheme for

γ	σ	r^l	r^b	r	T
0	0.2	0.001	0.3	0.005	0.5

Table 1: Parameters

BSDEs take the information of r and r^l into account and it cause the numerical error. In case of call option, it shows bigger error when it is out of money and it requires burdensome computational cost to mitigate the error. Therefore, the results of this chapter suggest to choose proper covenants to make the XVA pricing problem linear rather than resorting to naive numerical schemes unless we have a delicate algorithm. The details are as follows. We use the parameters given in Table 1 and choose the number of a regular time grid as N with step size $h = \frac{T}{N}$ and the simulation number as n. The stock price is approximated by,

$$\begin{aligned} S^k(0) =& S_0 \\ S^k(t_{i+1}) =& S^k(t_i) + rS^k(t_i)h + \sigma S^k(t_i)\Delta W^k(t_{i+1}), \quad i = 0, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

for $k = 1, \dots, n$ where $\Delta W^k(t_{i+1}) = W^k(t_{i+1}) - W^k(t_i)$. And we use the following recursion:

$$\tilde{Y}^k(T) = (\tilde{S}^k(T) - \tilde{\kappa})^+ \tag{75}$$

$$\tilde{Z}^k(t_i) = \frac{1}{h}\mathbb{E}(\tilde{Y}^k(t_{i+1})\Delta W^k(i+1)|\mathcal{F}_{t_i}) \tag{76}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Y}^k(t_i) =& \mathbb{E}(\tilde{Y}^k(t_{i+1}) - b^l(\tilde{Y}^k(t_{i+1}) - \sigma^{-1}\tilde{Z}^k(t_i))^+ \\ &+ b^b(\tilde{Y}^k(t_{i+1}) - \sigma^{-1}\tilde{Z}^k(t_i))^- h)|\mathcal{F}_{t_i}) \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Here $Z(t)$ indicates $\xi_t S_t$ and the conditional expectation is calculated by least square regression with polynomial bases. Figure 3 represents the surface of relative error of the numerical solution with respect to S_0 and κ when the bases for regression is second order polynomial. The simulation number and the number of time grid are 10000 and 20. The graph shows the error is not negligible especially at out of money. The main source of error is from (77). When κ is big comparing to S_0, some samples that $\tilde{Y}^k(T) - \sigma^{-1}\tilde{Z}^k(t_{N-1}) < 0$ refers r^l which actually should not be considered. We count the frequency of such samples and compare with the relative error with respect to exercise price, κ, at



(a) Relative error with S_0 and κ

(b) Frequency referring r^l

Figure 3: Source of error



(a) n=5000

(b) n=10000

Figure 4: Error change according to N. At each simulation, the conditional expectation is calculated by regression with second and third order polynomial.

$S_0 = 1$ in Figure 4. Here, frequency means (# of time to use r^l)/nN. When κ is big, many samples in the simulation begin with $\tilde{Y}^k(T) = 0$, so refer r^l more. This error can be diluted depending on the simulation number, the number of time grid and how much correctly we calculate the conditional expectation. Figure 3 describes the change of the relative error according to the number of time grid and the order of bases to compute the conditional expectation. The number of sample is fixed as 5000 and 10000 in Figure (4a) and (4b), respectively. As the graph shows, in order for the error to be sufficiently small, a considerable amount of computation is required. Fortunately, in this case, we intentionally choose the short maturity, 0.5, so we have the small error when N is around 30. However, if multi-assets are considered or the maturity is long, huge computation becomes necessary. Therefore, it is still beneficial for us to obtain a linear pricing problem unless we have a proper numerical algorithm. We may consider analytical approximation recently suggested in Gobet & Pagliarani (2015). However,

it only considers FVA and the approximation error depends on the maturity, so we rather suggest it as a start point of further research for general numerical scheme.

Acknowledgments.

The authors thank the organizers of Risk Measures, XVA Analysis, Capital Allocation and Central Counterparties workshop for inviting us to present this paper. The authors also presented this paper and got helpful feedback at Numerical methods and models for financial risk management workshop. Especially, we express appreciation to Stéphane Crépey and Dylan Possamaï for valuable discussions. For joining the workshops, the first author was partially supported by Centre for Quantitative Finance, National University of Singapore. The second author is supported by NUS Grant R-146-000-219-112.

References

Bergman, Y. Z. (1995). Option pricing with differential interest rates. *Review of Financial Studies*, *8*(2), 475–500.

Bichuch, M., Capponi, A., & Sturm, S. (2015a). Arbitrage-free pricing of XVA–part I: Framework and explicit examples. *Available at SSRN 2554600*.

Bichuch, M., Capponi, A., & Sturm, S. (2015b). Arbitrage-free pricing of XVA–part II: Pde representation and numerical analysis. *Available at SSRN 2568118*.

Bielecki, T. R., Jeanblanc, M., & Rutkowski, M. (2008). Pricing and trading credit default swaps in a hazard process model. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, *18*(6), 2495–2529.

Bielecki, T. R., & Rutkowski, M. (2015). Valuation and hedging of contracts with funding costs and collateralization. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, *6*(1), 594–655.

Bo, L., & Capponi, A. (2016). Optimal credit investment with borrowing costs. *To appear in Mathematics of Operations Research. Available at SSRN 2829654*.

Brigo, D., Buescu, C., & Rutkowski, M. (2016). Funding, repo and credit inclusion in option pricing via dividends. *Available at arXiv 1602.05998*.

Brigo, D., Liu, Q. D., Pallavicini, A., & Sloth, D. (2014). Nonlinear valuation under collateral, credit risk and funding costs: A numerical case study extending Black-Scholes. *Handbook in Fixed-Income Securities, Wiley*.

Brigo, D., Morini, M., & Pallavicini, A. (2013). *Counterparty credit risk, collateral and funding: with pricing cases for all asset classes*. John Wiley & Sons.

Burgard, C., & Kjaer, M. (2011a). In the balance. *Risk, November*, 72–75.

Burgard, C., & Kjaer, M. (2011b). Partial differential equation representations of derivatives with bilateral counterparty risk and funding costs. *The Journal of Credit Risk*, *7*(3), 1–19.

Castagna, A. (2012a). On the dynamic replication of the dva: Do banks hedge their debit value adjustment or their destroying value adjustment? *Available at SSRN 1989403*.

Castagna, A. (2012b). Yes, fva is a cost for derivatives desks. *Available at SSRN 2141663*.

Chung, S., Keppo, J., & Yuan, X. (2015). The impact of Volcker rule on bank profits and default probabilities. *Available at SSRN 2167773*.

Crépey, S. (2015a). Bilateral counterparty risk under funding constraints—part II: CVA. *Mathematical Finance*, *25*(1), 23–50.

Crépey, S. (2015b). Bilateral counterparty risk under funding constraints—part I: Pricing. *Mathematical Finance*, *25*(1), 1–22.

Crépey, S., Bielecki, T. R., & Brigo, D. (2014). *Counterparty risk and funding: A tale of two puzzles*. CRC Press.

Crépey, S., & Song, S. (2016). Counterparty risk and funding: Immersion and beyond. *Finance and Stochastics*, *20*(4), 901–930.

Cvitanić, J., & Karatzas, I. (1993). Hedging contingent claims with constrained portfolios. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 652–681.

Delong, Ł. (2013). *Backward stochastic differential equations with jumps and their actuarial and financial applications* (Vol. 201) (No. 3). Springer.

Di Nunno, G., Øksendal, B. K., & Proske, F. (2009). *Malliavin calculus for lévy processes with applications to finance* (Vol. 2). Springer.

El Karoui, N., Peng, S., & Quenez, M. C. (1997). Backward stochastic differential equations in finance. *Mathematical finance*, *7*(1), 1–71.

Gobet, E., & Pagliarani, S. (2015). Analytical approximations of bsdes with nonsmooth driver. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, *6*(1), 919–958.

He, S., & Yan, J. (1992). *Semimartingale theory and stochastic calculus*. Taylor & Francis.

Hull, J., & White, A. (2012). The fva debate. *Risk*, *25*, 83.

Korn, R. (1995). Contingent claim valuation in a market with different interest rates. *Zeitschrift für Operations Research*, *42*(3), 255–274.

Piterbarg, V. (2010). Funding beyond discounting: collateral agreements and derivatives pricing. *Risk*, *23*(2), 97.

Quenez, M.-C., & Sulem, A. (2013). Bsdes with jumps, optimization and applications to dynamic risk measures. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, *123*(8), 3328–3357.

Wu, L. (2015). Cva and fva to derivatives trades collateralized by cash. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, *18*(05), 1550035.